

Remarks

This is a Response to the Official Action dated October 26, 2004.

Specification

This response amends paragraph at page 10, line 24 to page 11, lines 8 by replacing reference number “21” with reference number “28.” Support for this amendment may be found in Figure 4 of the application.

This response amends paragraph at page 12, lines 26-29 by replacing reference number “26” with reference number “29.” Support for this amendment may be found in Figure 4 of the application.

This response amends paragraph at page 12, line 30 to page 13, line 15 by replacing reference number “55” for service system with reference number “40” and replacing reference number “56Z” with reference number “20Z.” Support for these amendments may be found in Figure 4 of the application.

Claims

Claims 1, 4-9, 11, 13-16, 18 and 20-25 are currently pending in the Application and Claims 27-29 are newly presented herein.

Claim 1, 4-9, 11, 13-16, 18 and 20-25

Although some of the above-listed claim amendments have been presented in the previous response, Applicant respectfully submits these amendments again to show all of the amendments made. Due to Applicant’s unintentional oversight, the following claim amendments made in a response dated July 29, 2004 were not shown as required by MPEP.

Claim 1 presently submitted further shows the terms “both” and “using” as being deleted and the term “sub-systems” being amended to “sub-system.”

Claim 15 presently submitted further shows the term “obtained” as being deleted and Claim 15 is identified as being “(currently amended).”

Claims 20 and 21 presently submitted are identified as being “(original).” Although Claims 20 and 21 were identified as “(previously presented),” they were never amended and are as originally filed.

Claim 24 presently submitted further shows the term “transmitters” being amended to “transmitter” and the term “indicators” being amended to “indicator.”

New Claims

This response adds new claims 27-29. The new claims are used to broaden the scope of the invention and are **not** offered in response to the Examiner’s rejections.

The support for the new Claims 27-29 can be found on page 10, lines 13-17 of the specification.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection

Claims 1, 4-5, 7-9, 11, 13, 15-18 and 22-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of Koshima (U.S. Patent No. 6,415,155) and further in view of Seraj (U.S. Patent No. 6,055,434).

Applicant submits that the Examiner has **not** established a *prima facie* case of obviousness for the claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Applicant notes:

“To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. **Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.** The teaching or suggestion to

make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, not in applicant's disclosure" (emphases added) *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Applicant submits that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established for the reasons set forth below.

Applicant submits that the Examiner has failed to show that Koshima and Seraj teach each and every element as claimed in the present application.

Claim 1:

Applicant submits that the Examiner has not shown that Koshima and Seraj disclose, suggest or teach, *inter alia*, at least the following features recited by Claim 1, as amended, of the present application:

“transmitting said specific information to said mobile device”

Koshima discloses a location system and method for identifying the position of mobile terminal. See Title of Koshima. According to Koshima, the mobile terminal “7” transmits signal information from repeaters “5” and transmitters “6” to center station “1,” wherein the location of mobile terminal “7” is indicated to the staff of the center station “1.” See column 3, line 67 to column 4, line 6 and column 4, lines 23-24 of Koshima. Because Koshima teaches only disclosing the location of mobile terminal “7” to the staff of the center station “1,” Koshima does not teach, disclose or suggest “transmitting said specific information to said mobile device” as recited in the amended Claim 1.

Seraj discloses a method and system that would allow the service providers to locate a mobile station in case of an emergency. See column 1, line 56 to column 2, line 19 of Seraj. According to Seraj, the mobile station “10” transmits identification data from the closest beacon “190” to the telecommunications network “40/35,” wherein the proximate location of the mobile station “10” is determined by determining the location of the beacon “190” associated with the transmitted identification data. See column 6, lines 8-34

of Seraj. Because Seraj teaches a method and system that would allow the service providers to locate a mobile station in case of an emergency, Seraj does not teach, disclose or suggest “transmitting said specific information to said mobile device” as recited in the amended Claim 1.

Applicant submits that the Examiner has not shown that Koshima and Seraj discloses, suggests or teaches “transmitting said specific information to said mobile device” as recited in Claim 1, as amended. Hence, Claim 1 is patentable over Koshima and Seraj and should be allowed by the Examiner.

Claims 4-5, 7-9, 11, 13, 15 and 27 depend from Claim 1. “If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious.” *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, in light of the above discussion of Claim 1, Applicant submits that Claims 4-5, 7-9, 11, 13, 15 and 27 are also allowable.

Applicant submits that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for the claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 16:

Applicant submits that the Examiner has not shown that Koshima and Seraj disclose, suggest or teach, *inter alia*, at least the following features recited by Claim 16 of the present application:

“A mobile device comprising: ... an information-retrieval arrangement ... to retrieve specific information having a relation to the current location of the mobile device”

Koshima discloses a location system and method for identifying the position of mobile terminal. See Title of Koshima. According to Koshima, the mobile terminal “7” transmits signal information from repeaters “5” and transmitters “6” to center station “1,” wherein

the location of mobile terminal “7” is indicated to the staff of the center station “1.” See column 3, line 67 to column 4, line 6 and column 4, lines 23-24 of Koshima. Because Koshima teaches only disclosing the location of mobile terminal “7” to the staff of the center station “1,” Koshima does not teach, disclose or suggest the mobile terminal “7” as being capable of retrieving the location information. Hence, Kishima does not teach disclose or suggest a “mobile device comprising: ... an information-retrieval arrangement ... to retrieve specific information having a relation to the current location of the mobile device” as recited in Claim 16.

Seraj discloses a method and system that would allow the service providers to locate a mobile station in case of an emergency. See column 1, line 56 to column 2, line 19 of Seraj. According to Seraj, the mobile station “10” transmits identification data from the closest beacon “190” to the telecommunications network “40/35,” wherein the proximate location of the mobile station “10” is determined by determining the location of the beacon “190” associated with the transmitted identification data. See column 6, lines 8-34 of Seraj. Because Seraj teaches a method and system that would allow the service providers to locate a mobile station “10” in case of an emergency, Seraj does not teach, disclose or suggest the mobile station “10” as being capable of retrieving the location information. Hence, Seraj does not teach disclose or suggest a “mobile device comprising: ... an information-retrieval arrangement ... to retrieve specific information having a relation to the current location of the mobile device” as recited in Claim 16.

Applicant submits that the Examiner has not shown that Koshima and Seraj discloses, suggests or teaches a “mobile device comprising: ... an information-retrieval arrangement ... to retrieve specific information having a relation to the current location of the mobile device” as recited in Claim 16. Hence, Claim 16 is patentable over Koshima and Seraj and should be allowed by the Examiner.

Claims 18, 20-21 depend from Claim 16. Therefore, in light of the above discussion of Claim 16, Applicant submits that Claims 18, 20-21 are also allowable.

Applicant submits that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for the claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 22:

Applicant submits that the Examiner has not shown that Koshima and Seraj disclose, suggest or teach, *inter alia*, at least the following features recited by Claim 22, as amended, of the present application:

“transmitting said data record to said mobile user”

Applicant submits that, as least for the reasons stated above, Koshima and Seraj do not teach disclose or suggest “transmitting said data record to said mobile user” as recited in Claim 22. Hence, Claim 22 is patentable over Koshima and Seraj and should be allowed by the Examiner. Claims 23 and 28 depend from Claim 22. Therefore, in light of the above discussion, Applicant submits that Claims 23 and 28 are also allowable.

Applicant submits that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for the claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 24:

Applicant submits that the Examiner has not shown that Koshima and Seraj disclose, suggest or teach, *inter alia*, at least the following features recited by Claim 24 of the present application:

“A service system comprising: ... a request handler for receiving a request ... and to return ... the requested specific information”

Koshima discloses a location system and method for identifying the position of mobile terminal. See Title of Koshima. According to Koshima, the mobile terminal “7” transmits signal information from repeaters “5” and transmitters “6” to center station “1,” wherein the location of mobile terminal “7” is indicated to the staff of the center station “1.” See

column 3, line 67 to column 4, line 6 and column 4, lines 23-24 of Koshima. Because Koshima teaches only disclosing the location of mobile terminal “7” to the staff of the center station “1,” Koshima does not teach, disclose or suggest the center station “1” as returning the location information to the mobile terminal “7.” Hence, Kishima does not teach disclose or suggest a “service system comprising: ... a request handler for receiving a request ... and to return ... the requested specific information” as recited in Claim 24.

Seraj discloses a method and system that would allow the service providers to locate a mobile station in case of an emergency. See column 1, line 56 to column 2, line 19 of Seraj. According to Seraj, the mobile station “10” transmits identification data from the closest beacon “190” to the telecommunications network “40/35,” wherein the proximate location of the mobile station “10” is determined by determining the location of the beacon “190” associated with the transmitted identification data. See column 6, lines 8-34 of Seraj. Because Seraj teaches a method and system that would allow the service providers to locate a mobile station “10” in case of an emergency, Seraj does not teach, disclose or suggest the service providers as returning the location information to the mobile station “10.” Hence, Seraj does not teach disclose or suggest a “service system comprising: ... a request handler for receiving a request ... and to return ... the requested specific information” as recited in Claim 24.

Applicant submits that the Examiner has not shown that Koshima and Seraj discloses, suggests or teaches a “service system comprising: ... a request handler for receiving a request ... and to return ... the requested specific information” as recited in Claim 24. Hence, Claim 24 is patentable over Koshima and Seraj and should be allowed by the Examiner.

Claims 25 and 29 depend from Claim 24. Therefore, in light of the above discussion of Claim 24, Applicant submits that Claims 25 and 29 are also allowable.

Applicant submits that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for the claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of all the claims are respectfully solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required or credit overpayment to deposit account no. 08-2025. In particular, if this response is not timely filed, then the Commissioner is authorized to treat this response as including a petition to extend the time period pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136 (a) requesting an extension of time of the number of months necessary to make this response timely filed and the petition fee due in connection therewith may be charged to deposit account no. 08-2025.


I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Post Office with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on

January 24, 2005

(Date of Deposit)

Corinda Humphrey

(Name of Person Signing)




(Signature)

January 24, 2005

(Date)

Respectfully submitted,



Robert Popa

Attorney for Applicants

Reg. No. 43,010

LADAS & PARRY

5670 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 2100

Los Angeles, California 90036

(323) 934-2300